



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,055	12/15/2000	Greg Zhang	16523-117	4317

32662 7590 03/22/2004

FELIX L. FISCHER, ATTORNEY AT LAW
1607 MISSION DRIVE
SUITE 204
SOLVANG, CA 93463

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2661

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/739,055

Applicant(s)

ZHANG, GREG

Examiner

Salvatore Cangialosi

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-24 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 13-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2661

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chang et al or Perkins et al in view of either Inoue et al or Nordman.

Regarding claim 1, either Chang et al (See Abstract and Figs. 5-12) or Perkins et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 4, lines 35-57) disclose an apparatus for assigning a mobile host having a permanent IP address with an in care of address at a foreign base station substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the dynamic IP address assignment for the foreign base station. It is noted that the in care of address at a foreign base station is obviously a IP address. Each of either Inoue et al ((See Col. 8, lines 40-50) or Nordman (See Col. 2, lines 25-45) show typical dynamic IP

Art Unit: 2661

address assignment to a mobile host. Note that either Inoue et al also states that the mobile has a fixed address. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Chang et al or Perkins et al because they are functional equivalents of the data structures in the primary items of evidence. Regarding claim 11, either Chang et al (See Abstract and Figs. 5-12) or Perkins et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 4, lines 35-57) disclose an apparatus for assigning a mobile host having a permanent IP address with an in care of address at a foreign base station substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the dynamic IP address assignment for the foreign base station. It is noted that the in care of address at a foreign base station is obviously a IP address. Each of either Inoue et al ((See Col. 8, lines 40-50) or Nordman (See Col. 2, lines 25-45) show typical dynamic IP address assignment to a mobile host. Note that either Inoue et al also states that the mobile has a fixed address. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Chang et al or Perkins et al because they are functional equivalents of the data structures in the primary items of evidence. Regarding claim 12, either Chang et al (See Abstract and Figs. 5-12) or Perkins et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 4, lines 35-57) disclose an apparatus for assigning a mobile host having a permanent IP address with an in care of address at a

Serial Number: 09/739,055

4

Art Unit: 2661

foreign base station substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the dynamic IP address assignment for the foreign base station. It is noted that the in care of address at a foreign base station is obviously a IP address. Each of either Inoue et al ((See Col. 8, lines 40-50) or Nordman (See Col. 2, lines 25-45) show typical dynamic IP address assignment to a mobile host. Note that either Inoue et al also states that the mobile has a fixed address. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Chang et al or Perkins et al because they are functional equivalents of the data structures in the primary items of evidence.

Claims 2-10,13-15 are objected to as being dependent on rejected claims but are allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 16-24 are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number (703) 305-1837. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas Olms, can be reached at (703) 305-4703.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Serial Number: 09/739,055


5

Art Unit: 2661

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park
II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Sixth
Floor(Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of
this application or proceeding should be directed to the
Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.


SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222